EXHIBIT D

Transcript April 7 2006.txt

THE COURT: Without getting into the blame game, if, 12 13 for example, the \$1 million is all he has, for example, to pay 14 for his defense and that when the bail was set it could be 15 argued that people didn't anticipate in good faith that there 16 would be such a delay between indictment and when the trial 17 would actually take place, why isn't that enough? 18

MS. McEVOY: Because it is not relevant to the issue 19 of whether he poses a risk of appearance.

THE COURT: Then why wouldn't the other argument that 21 Mr. Colton makes, his compliance with the conditions thus far? 22 At the beginning stage, it is one thing; it is a bit of a leap 23 of faith. On the other hand, there is a bit of a track record, 24 Mr. Colton would say almost a year's worth of a track record. MS. McEVOY: I think the case law and certainly the

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

29

647rvilc

20

25

11

12

13

23

24

우

우

1 act itself contemplates a changed circumstance with respect to his risk of appearance to be necessary in order for the conditions to be changed. I don't think that has been presented here.

The administration of justice taking longer because of 5 various motions and privilege issues I think is a separate 6 issue from whether or not there are changed circumstances with 7 respect to his risk of appearance in this case, which is what the Bail Reform Act looks at to determine whether or not his bail conditions should be modified. 10

THE COURT: Mr. Litt was whispering something to you. No? Just whistling? Mr. Colton.

MR. COLTON: Two issues. First, the threshold 14 question. Ms. McEvoy posits that the defense must demonstrate 15 to the Court a set of changed circumstances. I don't see that 16 in 3142. 3142, specifically 3142(c)(3), says, "The judicial 17 officer may at any time amend the order to impose additional or 18 different conditions of release." It doesn't impose, as I read 19 it, unless I am missing something, a burden of proof on either 20 side. It merely asks the court to make the determination 21 earlier, in 3142(c), to impose the least restrictive conditions 22 to assure appearance.

THE COURT: Ms. McEvoy?

MS. McEVOY: I think defense counsel's argument that compliance suggests that his bail conditions should be changed SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

30

647rvilc

would apply in almost every case. 1

THE COURT: I am more focused on the first point. I 2 3 agree that that in and of itself would not justify a change. 4 As you point out, that would always be the case. The message 5 that it would send to people is behave yourself for a couple of

Page 17

Transcript April 7 2006.txt

6 months, then get your bail conditions reduced so you can then 7 flee and not pose so much of a cost to those who are putting up security for your bond.

My view is that one changed circumstance is that the 10 trial has gone on, the trial has been delayed longer than 11 people expected. In my view, again, I don't think there is 12 anything that contravenes the statute or Mr. Tanaka's constitutional rights from that, but I don't know that it is 14 improper for the Court to take into account the delay in terms 15 of evaluating the bail conditions.

Moreover, as Mr. Tanaka suggests, more than suggests, 17 as he argues, at the risk perhaps of alienating those sitting 18 next to him at the same table, his bail conditions are more 19 stringent than those of his co-defendant. I am not sure why 20 that at this point needs to be the case. That is just as a way 21 of sending a message to Mr. Hoffman and Ms. Wolfe that I am not 22 going to entertain an application from them because I think Mr. 23 Vilar's conditions are right in any event.

MS. McEVOY: As your Honor assessed, and certainly the 25 magistrate judge also assessed in setting the bail conditions SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

우

647rvilc

9

16

24

8

13

15

16

18 19

17

21

24

1 early on have not changed. A determination has been made that

31

2 \$8 million is sufficient security and the least security that

3 is necessary in order to ensure the defendant's appearance.

The only thing that has changed since then is that the

defendant has appeared, which is true, as your Honor noted, in

a number of cases. I think it is also pretty common for a 7

trial date to be adjourned, and that also is not unique.

If the factors are the same in terms of what the defendant's risk of appearance is from when your Honor 10 initially determined that that was the appropriate amount of 11 security, under 3142 the government doesn't see how that really constitutes a changed circumstance. 12

THE COURT: Where are you looking at the changed 14 circumstance?

MS. McEVOY: That is the case law interpreting 3142.

THE COURT: So when it says may at any time amend, it is only if there is a change in circumstances?

MS. McEVOY: Yes.

THE COURT: What about another change in circumstance 20 from the standpoint of Mr. Tanaka might need the money to pay for his defense? Why isn't that a change in his circumstance 22 at least? That is suggested to me as one of the reasons that 23 he would like the money freed up.

MS. McEVOY: It also is suggested to your Honor that 25 the defendant would like the money to be freed up so he could SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

Transcript April 7 2006.txt

647rvilc

trade. 1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

22 23

24

25

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

16

THE COURT: Maybe so he could afford his lawyers. He is optimistic in his trading ability, I recognize that.

MS. McEVOY: There are a number of reasons why the defendant may want that extra million dollars. But that, again, is not the assessment. The assessment is whether \$8 million is sufficient security or is required security to assure the defendant's appearance.

THE COURT: Since I didn't set the bail, whose assets are we talking about here, the 7 million?

MR. COLTON: Mr. Tanaka's son Mark, his sister, and his elderly mother. There is probably no greater group of moral suasion than that group. He is actually living with his son Mark right now and sees him on a daily basis.

THE COURT: I am going to in part grant the request. What I am going to do at this stage is reduce the cash amount 17 to \$500,000. I am going to do so because I think that this 18 case has gone a little longer than could reasonably have been anticipated and it has been represented to me that Mr. Tanaka 20 needs the money to help finance his defense. I think that is a 21 reasonable request.

I am not granting the request in its entirety, because at this point, as I said, I don't want the trial to get delayed longer than this fall.

> In granting this request, though, in part, I want it SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

> > 33

647rvilc

1 to be crystal clear I don't think that one of the changed 2 circumstances is any sort of dilatory conduct on behalf of the government in its production of the discovery in this case or its handling of the privileged matters.

I have said this before, I will say it again: I think all attorneys on this case who have a well-earned reputation in this community have been working very hard. That is apparent to me even though I obviously don't see you all day-to-day. I am impressed by the quality of the work. I am impressed by the quantity of the work.

I don't think it has been fair to the extent the 12 government is suggesting a dilatory conduct on behalf of the 13 defense lawyers, and I don't think it is fair at all from what 14 I have heard to suggest that the government has been dilatory 15 at all.

It is absolutely true, as Mr. Barofsky says, that when 17 you are dealing with tens of thousands of pages of documents 18 and terabytes and gigabytes of computer data, some of which 19 come from a foreign country that involve encryption, that 20 involve foreign language, that involve technical difficulties 21 that arise from the quantity of the materials at issue here, 22 resource constraints are not bad faith. In any event, I think

우